

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 5, 6, 9-16, 21, and 23 remain canceled. While applicants do not agree with the rejections, applicants amend independent claims 1, 24, 29, and 32 herein.

Each of amended independent claims 1 and 24 recites, in part, “the distal portion including a first hook and the proximal portion including a second hook, each of the first hook and the second hook adapted for connecting to a delivery system to facilitate winding the coil segment to a reduced width for delivering the coil segment into the body lumen of the patient and for removing the coil segment from the body lumen of the patient.”

Applicants make these claim changes only to expedite prosecution and move to allowance as soon as possible. Applicants submit that the claim changes introduce no new matter. Support for the amended claims can be found throughout the application as originally-filed and in, for example, paragraphs [0035], [0045], [0047], and [0049]. Favorable reconsideration in light of the remarks which follow is respectfully requested.

35 USC §103 Rejections Based on Beyar/Mikus/Goicoechea/Hachtman

Claims 1-4, 17-20, 22, 24-29, and 32 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over US Patent 5,372,600 to Beyar et al. (hereinafter “Beyar”), U.S. Patent 5,830,179 to Mikus et al. (hereinafter “Mikus”), and U.S. Patent 6,010,530 to Goicoechea (hereinafter “Goicoechea”).

Claims 7, 8, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) over Beyar, Mikus, Goicoechea, and U.S. Patent 5,645,559 to Hachtman et al. (hereinafter “Hachtman”).

Of these rejected claims, claims 1 and 24 are independent claims. Beyar, Mikus, and Goicoechea thus are the basis for and the primary references used in all of the dependent claim rejections.

Beyar teaches a stent that includes balls disposed on either end of the stent for the sole purpose of restraining the stent to delivery system during the insertion of the stent into a body. The balls are used in conjunction with a delivery system to facilitate the insertion of the stent in a restrained state into the body. See, for example, FIGS. 6, 13, and 14, column 4, lines 28-46, and column 7, lines 8-17.

Although Beyar teaches the use of a stent that includes balls disposed on either end of the stent in conjunction with a delivery system to restrain and facilitate the insertion of the

stent into a body, Beyar is completely silent and does not teach or suggest the use of first and second hooks on a stent for reducing the width of a coil segment during the delivery and insertion of the stent into a body lumen and during the removal of the stent from the body lumen of the patient. Rather, Beyar teaches that the balls are used for the purpose of facilitating insertion of the stent only.

Applicants submit that Mikus and Goicoechea also are completely silent with respect to the first and second hooks as recited in amended independent claims 1 and 24.

Because each of Bayer, Mikus, and Goicoechea is deficient in the same way, no combination of Bayer, Mikus, and Goicoechea could possibly result in the limitations recited in independent claims 1 and 24. Additionally, applicants submit that Hachtman does not remedy the deficiencies of Bayer, Mikus, and Goicoechea.

Accordingly, amended independent claims 1 and 24, and all claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
BROWN RUDNICK LLP

By /Anil P. Ranganath/
Anil P. Ranganath
Reg. No. 66,502
Direct 617-856-8144
aranganath@brownrudnick.com
Brown Rudnick LLP
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111

1757817